

## **2. BUILDING LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS AND GOVERNING ONE-STOP SYSTEMS**

GOAL 1. BUILD EFFECTIVE LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS .....	2-2
Strategy 1. Build on Existing Histories of Collaboration.....	2-2
Build on Histories of JTPA and ES/UI Collaboration .....	2-3
Strategy 2. Begin With a Limited Number of Core Partners .....	2-6
Strategy 3. Create Partnerships That Involve All DOL- Funded Programs.....	2-8
Strategy 4. Involve Agencies Responsible for Other Workforce Development Programs.....	2-10
GOAL 2. ORGANIZE ONE-STOP CENTERS INTO LOCAL SYSTEMS .....	2-18
Strategy 1. Develop Autonomous One-Stop Centers Supplemented by Staffed or Unstaffed Satellite Locations .....	2-18
Strategy 2. Form Local Networks with Interdependent One- Stop Centers .....	2-20
Strategy 3. Coordinate Referrals to Off-Site Partners .....	2-21
GOAL 3. FORM EFFECTIVE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES FOR LOCAL ONE-STOP SYSTEMS.....	2-23
Strategy 1. Develop Governance or Advisory Bodies to Guide Local One-Stop Systems .....	2-23
Strategy 2. Design Center and Network Management Structures.....	2-25
Strategy 3. Develop “Operations Teams” to Plan for Continuous Improvement of One-Stop Operations .....	2-28
GOAL 4. DEVELOP STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS TO SUPPORT COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION OF ONE-STOP SERVICES .....	2-29
RESOURCES.....	2-31



## **2. BUILDING LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS AND GOVERNING ONE-STOP SYSTEMS**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Forming effective partnerships among the organizations and agencies responsible for various aspects of workforce development service planning and delivery is key to building a local One-Stop system. Although some agencies become involved in One-Stop planning and development because they are mandated to do so, in many sites, local agencies have wide discretion in deciding whether additional partners will be involved in One-Stop system-building efforts and what roles different partners will play in the day-to-day delivery of One-Stop services.

The different agencies and organizations involved in One-Stop planning and system design form partnerships—even though they have distinct missions and goals—because they have common interests. In most sites, agencies participating in One-Stop system-building perceive that the mutual benefits of increased collaboration will include reduced duplication of effort, increased economies of scale, and expanded outreach and service delivery capacities. Successful system-builders also have a commitment to using local partnerships to benefit job seekers and employers through improved accessibility, quality, and customer-orientation of workforce development services.

The change process requires careful planning, the development of trust between managers and staff of the partnering agencies, and, perhaps most importantly, a willingness to compromise. In this chapter we discuss strategies for forming local partnerships to support the One-Stop vision. Specifically this chapter offers suggestions for addressing the challenges associated with:

- Building effective local partnerships.
- Organizing centers into local One-Stop systems.
- Forming local governance structures.
- Staffing coordinated and integrated One-Stop services.

## **STRATEGIES TO ACCOMPLISH LOCAL SYSTEM-BUILDING GOALS**

### **GOAL 1. BUILD EFFECTIVE LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS**

Emerging local One-Stop systems vary greatly in the number and range of agencies involved in the initial stages of One-Stop system building. Some local areas prefer to start with small focused partnerships. These areas concentrate their early efforts on building collaborative relationships among the DOL-mandated partners responsible for ES, UI, and JTPA. Because service coordination linkages with Veterans Employment Services and Title V Older Worker programs are also required for receipt of federal One-Stop implementation grants, all One-Stop partnerships also involve the agencies responsible for delivering these services.

Other local areas feel that it is essential to develop broader partnerships early in the One-Stop planning process. These areas seek to involve a number of organizations in the planning, governance, and delivery of One-Stop services, including community and technical colleges, local educational agencies or school districts, vocational rehabilitation agencies, social service agencies, and economic development entities.

Whether their initial partnerships are broadly or narrowly focused, most sites have found that local partnerships are more effective if they (1) build on existing agency histories of collaboration, (2) expand over time to include the major local agencies with interests in local workforce development and economic development systems, and (3) involve the key agencies involved in local school-to-work and welfare-to-work initiatives.

#### **Strategy 1. Build on Existing Histories of Collaboration**

One-Stop systems do not develop in a vacuum. Each agency involved in the One-Stop process has some prior experience collaborating with other local agencies and service providers to build a collaborative system that serves the workforce development needs of individuals or businesses. Further developing and cultivating these existing relationships is critical to building One-Stop partnerships.

Building on previous collaborative efforts has many advantages in the One-Stop setting. First, One-Stop partners that have undertaken coordinated projects in the past begin the One-Stop planning and early implementation process with at least a rudimentary understanding of each other's program goals, eligibility requirements, and

reporting responsibilities. Second, partners may already have a clear understanding of how customers could benefit from improved coordination or collaboration across One-Stop partners. Third, and perhaps most importantly, previous successful collaborations make it easier for managers and service staff to meld their different agency “cultures” in pursuit of common goals. The organizational and governance structures developed for previous joint projects may also be transferable to the One-Stop planning process and may help avoid or reduce problems of “culture clash” that frequently occur when different agencies attempt to consolidate their operations.

### **Build on Histories of JTPA and ES/UI Collaboration**

In most emerging One-Stop systems, coordinating the work of the agencies responsible for JTPA and ES/UI services is seen as the most fundamental step of creating an effective One-Stop center. Although the JTPA and ES/UI systems have not always had smooth working relationships in many local areas, many states and local areas already have successfully undertaken joint projects. In a number of sites, JTPA and ES/UI systems have learned to collaborate over the last ten years while addressing the needs of dislocated workers affected by large-scale layoffs. Somewhat less frequently, local areas have histories of the co-location of JTPA and ES/UI services that precede the federal One-Stop initiative. JTPA and ES/UI partners with a history of co-location have sometimes developed designs for the coordinated delivery of job search assistance and/or job placement services to their mutual customers. Learning from these previous experiences can greatly facilitate the transition to shared management and delivery of One-Stop services.

#### **Examples of Building on Previous JTPA and ES/UI Collaboration Efforts**

##### **Example #1—Building on Efforts to Integrate JTPA and ES/UI Services.**

For the past decade, the state of Indiana had encouraged the co-location and integration of service delivery systems for JTPA and ES/UI. This experience gave local agencies a strong foundation for forming One-Stop partnerships. In Lawrenceburg, for example, JTPA and ES/UI functions were already cross-staffed even before One-Stop implementation. Staff of

partnering agencies had developed interagency service agreements and cost-allocation procedures that permitted individual staff to provide services funded by several different categorical programs administered by different agencies. **Lawrenceburg, Indiana**

**Example #2—Building on Efforts to Coordinate Services to Dislocated Workers.** Previous collaboration in serving dislocated workers was decisive in making the ES/UI and JTPA agencies willing to consider forming local One-Stop partnerships in New London, Connecticut. In Connecticut, the local ES and JTPA agencies had worked together in the late 1980s and early 1990s to create a series of jointly operated “transition centers” for dislocated workers. These experiences helped to improve substantially the initially tentative relations between these two core workforce development agencies and caused them to think of each other as allies in addressing customer needs. **New London, Connecticut**

**Example #3—Building on Efforts to Design Improved Services for Experienced Workers.** Local One-Stop partners in Baltimore began planning for the development of an integrated menu of employment and training services that would transcend agency and program boundaries. Previous Job Service and JTPA service models were not varied enough to meet the diverse needs of experienced dislocated workers. Coordinated efforts by local Job Service and JTPA partners to develop “customer-driven” services for dislocated workers as well as early intervention services for UI recipients under the Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services system were catalysts in the movement to reengineer and consolidate local workforce development services. **Baltimore, Maryland**

### **Build on Local Collaborative Efforts Among Additional One-Stop Partners**

In other cases, one or more workforce development partners have benefited from previously developed collaborative linkages with agencies responsible for programs such as vocational rehabilitation, welfare-to-work services, or family and social

services. Other local areas have benefited from a general tradition of interagency approaches to address community problems.

In some sites, previous efforts by local agencies to collaborate on the design and delivery of employment services to welfare recipients—e.g., by developing coordinated case management approaches and coordinated or consolidated customer services—have built the foundation for close working relationships between the agencies responsible for welfare-to-work services and other workforce development services. As a result of these previous collaboration efforts, local partners in these sites are often prepared to consider how they might benefit from further integration of welfare-to-work services into the One-Stop service delivery system.

Some local areas have benefited from a strong tradition of local interagency cooperation on a number of different issues, including developing coordinated workforce development and human and family services. In some such areas, local governments have supported the development of broad human resource “campuses” that accommodate a wide range of community service providers, including workforce development agencies.

**Examples of Building on Previous Collaborations  
Involving Additional One-Stop Partners**

**Example #1—Building on Efforts to Link JTPA and Welfare-to-Work Programs.** The broad One-Stop partnership in Anoka County, Minnesota, grew out of a 1988 decision by the county board of commissioners and the JTPA private industry council (PIC) to integrate welfare employment and training programs with JTPA. This has resulted in a long history of collaborative efforts between these two entities that has greatly facilitated the recent co-location of all county welfare workers within the One-Stop center.  
**Blaine, Minnesota**

**Example #2—Building on Evolving Partnerships between JTPA, ES, and JOBS.** In Wood County, Ohio, the One-Stop Employment Resources Center grew directly out of previous co-location and service consolidation between the JTPA program and the JOBS program for AFDC recipients. As a result of their ongoing collaboration efforts, both programs had already begun to develop closer ties with ES agency, as it became obvious that job search and employment services were an essential element of comprehensive services to promote customer self-sufficiency. **Bowling Green, Ohio**

**Example #3—Building on a Local Tradition of Interagency Problem Solving.** A decade-long tradition of developing interagency approaches to solve community problems was influential developing an effective broad One-Stop partnership in Anoka County, Minnesota. In the mid-1980s, this community had developed “fusion teams”—which brought together diverse county, state, and non-profit agencies to work toward the common goal of encouraging child support by non-custodial parents. This partnership process was adapted and applied to the process of planning the local One-Stop system.

Because of its support for collaborative human service approaches, the local community also acquired and donated the land used for the development of a “human service campus” housing over 40 agencies and issued tax-exempt revenue bonds to finance construction of this facility. **Blaine, Minnesota**

## **Strategy 2. Begin With a Limited Number of Core Partners**

Some local sites decide to begin their One-Stop systems by involving a limited number of core partners in planning and integrating on-site customer services. By working with a small number of agencies, local partners can learn how to combine different agency cultures and develop a menu of consolidated services. This experience can later be applied to bringing additional agency partners “on board.”

Other local One-Stop partnerships supplement a small number of *core* agency partners—each of which participates in key governance and service delivery functions



for One-Stop centers—with a number of *supporting* agency partners that play more limited system roles. Some supporting partners participate in overall One-Stop planning and governance processes but play only a minor role in delivering services at One-Stop centers. Other supporting partners may offer discrete services at One-Stop centers without being involved in the details of One-Stop system planning, governance, or service consolidation efforts. Thus, even in sites that involve only a few core partners, a number of other agencies often contribute in various ways to the overall operation of the local One-Stop system.

### **Examples of Beginning with a Few Core Partners**

**Example #1—Developing A Partnership Led by the JTPA Agency with On-Site Participation by the Agency Responsible for ES and UI.** At the Eastside Career Center in Baltimore, most full-time staff are employed by the Mayor’s Office of Employment Development (MOED), which administers all JTPA-funded services. In addition, a small number of on-site staff are Job Service (ES) employees. Although the community college participates as a member of the local One-Stop planning team and is an important off-site provider of occupational training for individuals and customized training for employers, the core on-site partners at the Eastside Career Center include only the agencies responsible for the ES, UI, and JTPA programs.

Despite a narrow range of participating partner organizations, the Eastside Career Center has made significant progress in marketing enhanced services to employers and broadening the center’s customer base to include a wide range of job-seekers, including members of the general public. **Baltimore, Maryland**

**Example #2—Developing A Core Partnership Between the State Agency Responsible for ES and UI and Regional Workforce Development**

**Boards.** In Connecticut, local *Connecticut Works* Centers are co-sponsored by the state agency responsible for ES and UI and regional workforce development boards, which are responsible for administering JTPA services and basic education preparation for individuals interested in further education or training. As local One-Stop systems develop, regional boards may coordinate a larger number of workforce development funding streams by adding additional local agency partners. However, by state fiat, local center management committee members may represent only public or non-profit entities that have training, education, or, employment as part of their mission. **State of Connecticut**

**Strategy 3. Create Partnerships That Involve All DOL-Funded Programs**

In addition to calling for involvement by the agencies responsible for the ES, UI, and JTPA programs, the U.S. Department of Labor's guidelines announcing the availability of DOL One-Stop implementation grant funds also mandate inclusion within One-Stop centers of Veterans Employment and Training (VETS) services and services provided under the Senior Community Service Employment Program authorized by Title V of the Older Americans Act. Most local areas start with JTPA, ES, and UI agency partners as the core of local One-Stop systems. The challenges and opportunities presented by integrating the two other mandated One-Stop programs—VETS and Title V Older Workers programs—are briefly discussed below.

**Veterans Employment and Training Services**

In most cases, Veterans Employment and Training Services (VETS) are staffed by the same agencies that provide ES and UI services. As a result, it is usually fairly easy to make VETS services available at One-Stop centers. However, finding ways to integrate the considerable expertise of Local Veterans Employment Representatives (LVERs) and Disabled Veterans Opportunity Program staff (DVOPs) to enhance One-Stop services as a whole has been a continuing challenge for One-Stop systems, due to

rules restricting VETS staff from working with customers not specifically eligible for VETS services.

At some centers, it has been possible to develop enhanced roles for VETS staff within One-Stop centers by arranging for individual VETS staff to split their time between VETS-funded programs and programs serving other targeted groups or the general public.

**Example of Involving VETS Staff In the Delivery of One-Stop Services**

At the time of the evaluation site visit, the veterans' representative at the Lawrenceburg Workforce Development Center had a 50%-time job assignment working with veterans. He had another 50%-time job assignment providing ES services. As a result of holding these two different positions, the veterans' representative was able to engage in cross-training that enabled him to perform any function in the center. All staff within the center believed that all veterans served by the One-Stop center benefited from the veterans' representative's broad job responsibilities.

**Lawrenceburg, Indiana**

**Title V Older Worker Programs**

In some local One-Stop centers, the agencies responsible for operating Title V older worker programs arrange for paid staff to provide on-site services to customers who qualify for Title V assistance. Another approach is for participants in the Senior Community Service Employment Program to be assigned to positions as receptionists or resource aides within One-Stop centers. Title V program participants can use their One-Stop center work assignments as opportunities to learn valuable new skills, such as the use of new computer technologies, at the same time that they provide a valuable service to One-Stop customers by helping customers orient themselves and find information in the center.

### **Examples of Involving Older Worker Program Agencies as One-Stop Partners**

**Example #1—Housing an Older Worker Program Staff Within a One-Stop Center.** In Iowa, funding is available from both Title V and a state-funded older worker program to help older workers pursue their employment needs and interests. An individual employed by the agency responsible for administering the state-funded older worker program is housed within the Des Moines Workforce Development Center and receives referrals of appropriate customers from other center partners. **Des Moines, Iowa**

**Example #2—Using a Title V Participant as an Intake Assistant.** The intake assistant at the Lawrenceburg, Indiana, Workforce Development Center is a Title V Older Worker program participant. This individual guides customers through the initial intake process and is being trained to provide an initial assessment of One-Stop customers' needs. Seeing this older staff member use computers as part of the intake process helps to reduce some customers' fear of the self-service computer technology that is available at the center. **Lawrenceburg, Indiana**

### **Strategy 4. Involve Agencies Responsible for Other Workforce Development Programs**

In addition to the federally mandated partners, local One-Stop partnerships often include community and technical colleges, secondary educational institutions, vocational rehabilitation, welfare, social service, and economic development agencies, as well as community-based organizations. In addition to these agencies, other One-Stop partners may also include agencies providing health-related and child-care services. One-Stop partnerships involving these agencies are described below.

#### **Agencies Responsible for Welfare-to-Work Initiatives**

Many areas have developed One-Stop partnerships that help link DOL-funded workforce development programs and welfare-to-work systems and services. In many sites, core One-Stop partners—particularly the agencies offering ES and JTPA

services—also deliver services funded by welfare-to-work programs, either as program administrators or as contracted service providers to state or local welfare agencies. In other sites, human service agency staff or contractors are responsible for the delivery of welfare-to-work services. State or local agencies responsible for assisting individuals to make the transition from time-limited cash assistance to self-sufficiency often find it advantageous to co-locate at One-Stop centers or to be represented by on-site staff offering welfare-to-work and transitional support services to welfare recipients.

Broad partnerships involving welfare-to-work and workforce development agencies can make it easier for both types of agencies to meet their goals by drawing on the combined staff expertise and resources of all programs. Welfare agency staff often have case management expertise and the ability to address a wide range of individual and household barriers to employment (including the provision of supportive services during the transition period). Workforce development staff often have special expertise in career counseling and information about labor markets and training opportunities. When coordinated, services from both funding streams can be combined to address individual customers' needs and interests.

### **Examples of Involving Welfare-to-Work Agencies as One-Stop Partners**

**Example #1—Co-Locating Income Maintenance and Child Care Services at One-Stop Centers to Emphasize the Employment Goals of Welfare Reform.** Over 100 staff from Anoka County's Income Maintenance Division and the County's Child Care Assistance Division joined the Workforce Center as core partners between mid-1996 and mid-1997. The timing of the integration of income maintenance and child care assistance staff into the Workforce Center is viewed as particularly appropriate, because new state welfare reform measures stipulate that as of July 1997, all TANF recipients with children aged 3 or over will be required to begin looking for work within ten days after finishing a 30-day group orientation.  
**Blaine, Minnesota**

**Example #2—Serving Welfare-to-Work Clients In a Work-Oriented Environment.** After co-locating at the Arlington Center to assist customers in the transition from welfare to employment, the JOBS counselor was enthusiastic about the changes she saw in her customers. In particular, she found that exposing welfare customers to the professional atmosphere of the center helped ease the usually difficult transition to work: *“I couldn’t even recognize my old customers when they first came in here,”* she said. *“Their attitude is so much more professional—you can see that many of them are ready and eager to have jobs.”* **Arlington, Texas**

### **Agencies Responsible for School-to-Work Initiatives**

In some local areas, One-Stop partners are actively involved in local planning for the school-to-work initiative. One-Stop centers in these areas are focal points for school-to-work implementation—partners not only collect and disseminate career and labor market information to schools and youth organizations, but invite youth into One-Stop career centers as direct center customers.

Broad partnerships between the agencies responsible for the school-to-work initiative and workforce development agencies encourage collaboration between general workforce preparation programs, schools, and employers in developing linkages between school and work for young people. With respect to employer customers, coordination between school-to-work and One-Stop partners makes it possible to offer employers a single access point to services to recruit currently qualified workers and help prepare the next generation of qualified workers.

### **Examples of Coordinating with School-to-Work Partners**

**Example #1—Making One-Stop Centers the Hub of Electronic Information On Careers and Labor Markets for School-to-Work Partners.** The Minnesota Workforce Center–Anoka County is the

administrator of a \$650,000 five-year school-to-work implementation grant, received in collaboration with five local independent school districts, a community college, and a technical college. As the hub for school-to-work implementation, the One-Stop center partners will coordinate collection and dissemination of career and labor market information to school-to-work partners. **Blaine, Minnesota**

**Example #2—Improving Linkages Between One-Stop Partners, Schools, and Employers on Behalf of Youth Customers.** At the Waukesha County, Wisconsin, Workforce Development Center, a non-profit agency called Partners for Education is charged with improving linkages between education and business. One project facilitated by this One-Stop partner was an effort to identify youth who are interested in apprenticeship opportunities with local employers. The center also maintains a career library broad enough to serve both youth and adult customers. This library—which has videos on over 100 occupations geared for youth going directly to work after high school, as well as information on two-year certificate programs, four-year colleges, and vocational training programs—receives funding from both school-to-work and One-Stop sources. **Pewaukee, Wisconsin**

**Example #3—Directly Serving In-School Youth.** In the absence of a strong local school-to-work initiative, local partners within the Des Moines Workforce Development Center developed their own programs targeted to in-school youth. In coordination with individual local high schools, center staff taught a semester-long on-site “Workforce for Teens” career awareness course for young people about to enter the labor market. **Des Moines, Iowa**

### **Other Roles for Secondary Education Agencies, School Districts, and Community and Technical Colleges**

Secondary educational institutions can also be important collaborators in planning to make One-Stop information services available to youth through remote access or cable linkages. In addition, many school districts or consortia may be available to provide on-site services such as adult basic education, English language training, assessment, and career counseling to One-Stop customers.

In some local areas, community or technical colleges may provide on-site education services or they may visit One-Stop centers periodically to provide information and referral to education and training programs. In other areas, community colleges may simply receive referrals or funding support from on-site partners to train One-Stop customers.

**Examples of Involving Secondary and Post-Secondary Educational Agencies as One-Stop Partners**

**Example #1—Involving a Secondary Education Organization as a Key Provider of One-Stop Services.** The Eastern Connecticut Regional Education Service Center (EastConn) is a non-profit educational organization created by local education agencies from 36 municipalities throughout eastern Connecticut. EastConn staff at the Willimantic Connecticut Works Center serve customers eligible for JTPA and Older Worker programs, develop all center-wide assessment materials, and train other case worker and counseling staff in the use of these materials. They also disseminate a variety of information on off-site adult and community education opportunities within the region. **Willimantic, Connecticut**

**Example #2—Having a Secondary School District Provide On-Site Educational Services to Adults and Youth.** Two school districts are represented on the Arlington, Texas, Career Center's site-based management committee. They also provide direct services to center customers. The Fort Worth Independent School District offers on-site evening classes in three levels of English as a Second Language (ESL). The Arlington Independent School District currently manages a JTPA contract with a local alternative high school which tries to get out-of-school youth back into the school system. **Arlington, Texas**



**Example #3—Involving a Technical College as a Core One-Stop Partner.**

The Waukesha County Workforce Development Center is located on the campus of the local technical college. The college has been a core partner throughout all phases of local One-Stop planning and implementation. Technical college employees provide a wide range of on-site services including customized training services for local employers, and assessment and career exploration services for individual customers. **Pewaukee, Wisconsin**

**Example #4—Having a Community College Partner Provide On-Site Adult Basic Education Services to One-Stop Customers.**

The Des Moines Area Community College leases classroom space for two ABE/GED classes at the One-Stop Center. The college is also playing a key role in the operation of a new assessment center within the One-Stop center. Through their liaison staff at the center, the center also maintains coordinated referral linkages with the college's Economic Development Group that provides employee retraining services to expanding and relocating businesses. **Des Moines, Iowa**

**Example #5—Using a Junior College Partner to Provide a Range of On-Site Services.**

Tarrant County Junior College offers adult basic education classes at the Arlington Career Center and contributes staff and funding for an on-site "Learning Center" within the career center. The college also maintains an on-site satellite of its Small Business Development Center, which provides information to persons seeking to start or expand businesses. **Arlington, Texas**

**Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies**

Vocational rehabilitation agencies or other local partners specializing in services to individuals with disabilities can be valuable partners in providing on-site services to One-Stop customers. Centers can also develop referral agreements with organizations providing specialized services to individuals with particular types of disabilities.

### **Examples of Involving Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies as One-Stop Partners**

#### **Example #1—Involving Several Agencies Serving Disabled Individuals.**

The local offices of the Texas Rehabilitation Commission are co-located within the One-Stop Center. Staff from this agency provide employment and training services for persons with disabilities, including assessment, case management, job training, and placement services. Goodwill, another key partner in the local One-Stop system that specializes in services to customers with disabilities offers on-site computer and clerical training at the Center. Although Goodwill staff are not co-located at the center full-time, the organization has entered into serious discussions about jointly purchasing a future site with other current One-Stop partners. **Arlington, Texas**

**Example #2—Developing An Interagency Agreement to Coordinate Services to Customers with Developmental Disabilities.** An agreement between the Indianapolis PIC and the county Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Agency provides for staff at the Eastside One-Stop Center to work with the VR agency's job coaches to provide employment opportunities for their developmentally disabled clients. **Indianapolis, Indiana**

**Example #3—Co-Locating A Variety of Employment-Related Services for Individuals with Disabilities at a One-Stop Center.** Achieve, an organization that operates under contract to the County Human Service Division, offers a “sheltered work” environment for persons with developmental disabilities on the same human services “campus” as the Minnesota Workforce Center–Anoka County. **Blaine, Minnesota**

### **Economic Development Agencies**

Because economic development agencies generally have a good understanding of the challenges local businesses face in remaining competitive and usually have already developed good rapport with a wide variety of local employers, they are often perceived as valuable local One-Stop partners, particularly in conducting outreach to employers and developing enhanced employer services, such as services to support

business formation, survival, and expansion. From the perspective of the economic development agencies, participation in a local One-Stop system is usually attractive, because the delivery of high-quality seamless labor exchange and other business services can improve the overall competitiveness of local businesses and support local economic expansion goals.

State or local economic development agencies can play particularly effective roles in delivering services to One-Stop business customers. Economic development partners can assist other One-Stop partner agencies in coordinating employer job listings, establishing and operating “business resource areas” within centers, and letting business know about any sources of publicly-funded services designed to assist “at-risk” or expanding firms.

**Example of Involving Economic Development Agencies as Local One-Stop Partners**

**Involving Economic Development Agencies in Expanding One-Stop Services to Local Businesses.** The Corporation for Regional Economic Development, a non-profit economic development organization for the Southeast Connecticut region has been an important partner in New London’s One-Stop implementation efforts, helping existing businesses in the region to expand their operations and helping new businesses become established. Recently, four staff from the state’s Department of Economic and Community Development have co-located with the Business Services Unit of the One-Stop center. **New London, Connecticut**

**Community-Based Organizations**

Local community-based organizations and organizations contracted to provide services under JTPA or welfare-to-work programs often play key roles in One-Stop center management and the delivery of services to local One-Stop customers. Although some sites consider only public agencies to be core One-Stop partners, others also considered the primary JTPA service provider agencies to be core One-Stop partners.

### **Examples of Involving Community-Based Organizations as One-Stop Partners**

**Example #1—Involving Community-Based Organizations in Center Management and Service Delivery.** Community-based organizations have historically played important roles in Baltimore in developing neighborhood-oriented improvement initiatives and providing services to local residents. The local One-Stop planning process has recognized the important contribution of community-based organizations and included them as key partners in the Career Center Network. Community-based organizations have been designated as the contracted managers of two of the three full-service One-Stop career centers in the city. **Baltimore, Maryland**

**Example #2—Involving a JTPA Contractor as a Core One-Stop Partner.** Goodwill Industries was awarded a contract to provide services to JTPA-eligible customers at all three One-Stop Centers. Goodwill had a center co-manager and service delivery staff on site at each of the three centers within the Indianapolis network of One-Stop centers. **Indianapolis, Indiana**

### **Other Agencies**

Other agencies that may be considered desirable local partners in some One-Stop systems include local mental health agencies, organizations serving migrant farmworkers, social service organizations, city health departments, and child care assistance agencies.

### **Examples of Involving Other Agencies as Local One-Stop Partners**

**Example #1—Arranging for On-Site Availability of Health and Social Services for One-Stop Customers.** The city health department funds a nurse assistant who maintains office hours at Baltimore's Eastside center

once a week to provide blood pressure screening and assist Center customers with problems such as weight reduction or referrals for medical problems. Until recent cutbacks eliminated funding for an on-site staff, the local United Way's "Call for Help" program also provided food, clothing, emergency services to homeless individuals, mental health counseling, and other supportive services to One-Stop customers. **Baltimore, Maryland**

**Example #2—Involving Several Social Service Agencies in the Delivery of On-Site Services.** At the Lake Jackson center, Consumer Credit Counseling Service, a community-based non-profit organization, offers Center customers free counseling in budget planning, dealing with creditors, avoiding bankruptcy, consolidating debt, and managing finances during periods of unemployment. Also, United Way offers various kinds of on-site counseling and assistance at the Center including crisis intervention and other emergency assistance such as referral to food pantries, utility assistance, and transportation to medical providers. The local staff of United Way and the Consumer Credit Counseling Service cross-trained in each other's programs and provided on-site services to Center customers on alternating weeks. **Lake Jackson, Texas**

## **GOAL 2. ORGANIZE ONE-STOP CENTERS INTO LOCAL SYSTEMS**

To ensure statewide geographic coverage, most states have identified local or regional workforce development service delivery areas for the design and delivery of One-Stop services. These service delivery areas are often based on previous administrative boundaries, such as local JTPA service delivery area boundaries. However some states have developed new service delivery areas specifically for One-Stop systems.

States and local areas vary in how many One-Stop centers they plan for each service delivery area and how they plan for One-Stop centers within the same service area to relate to each other. Local systems also vary in the extent to which they achieve an integrated service delivery system by co-locating multiple partners at a single One-Stop facility versus linking multiple service sites electronically. Below, we

discuss the varying strategies of (1) operating autonomous centers, (2) developing interdependent networks of One-Stop centers, and (3) developing linkages between on-site and off-site partners.

**Strategy 1. Develop Autonomous One-Stop Centers  
Supplemented by Staffed or Unstaffed Satellite Locations**

In some cases, states and local areas develop only one or two “full service” One-Stop centers per service delivery area. These full-service centers offer the distinct advantage of bringing together several One-Stop partners in one place and making a variety of services accessible to customers who visit them. Partners can also build on their co-location in a shared facility by integrating service delivery functions, making services seamless from the point of view of individuals and employers.

In multi-county or rural service delivery areas with low population densities and large distances between centers, however, geographical accessibility to a free-standing One-Stop center is a major concern. Therefore, to reach customers throughout their service areas, some areas with a single full-service One-Stop center develop close coordination linkages (including shared electronic information networks) with additional satellite service sites maintained by staff from local partner agencies—such as stand-alone ES and UI offices. Autonomous centers can also encourage customers to access automated information services by offering remote “dial in” access to information systems by telephone and personal computer.

Other approaches to supplement full-service One-Stop centers include the development of additional self-service locations with public information kiosks or computer work stations in libraries or shopping malls.

**Examples of Developing Autonomous One-Stop Centers**

**Example #1—Developing “Competing” Centers within a Service Delivery Area.** The Hamden County Regional Employment Board in Massachusetts created two largely autonomous centers by chartering two different entities to operate “competing” One-Stop career centers within its service delivery area. This is part of an overall strategy to increase the

choices available to local customers by encouraging friendly competition among career center operators. Located only about eight miles from its “sister” career center, the FutureWorks Career Center has differentiated itself from the other center by developing services oriented to its distinct local clientele. **Springfield, Massachusetts**

**Example #2—Expanding Access through Off-Site Mini-Career**

**Libraries.** In the Southeast Connecticut workforce development area, there will eventually be two full-service One-Stop centers. Although they will be overseen by the same regional workforce development board and local One-Stop management committee, each center will be responsible for developing its own cadre of local partners, its own menu of services, and its own local management team.

Additionally, career and labor market information will be available through “mini-career” libraries with networked connections to the One-Stop system, as a result of state-level agreements between Connecticut’s Department of Labor and the state library system. **New London, Connecticut**

**Example #3—Using Roving Staff to Reach Customers in Rural Areas.**

The Creston Workforce Development Center serves residents from eight sparsely populated counties in Southwestern Iowa. Staff representing the core partner agencies and programs—including ES, JTPA, Vocational Rehabilitation Services, and the local Area Agency on Aging—have developed an elaborate network of remote service locations throughout the region. Remote service sites include facilities maintained by a variety of entities, including government agencies, community-based organizations, and schools. Individual staff from the One-Stop center in Creston travel to these locations regularly to ensure that customers who cannot access services at the One-Stop center may receive staffed services. **Creston, Iowa**

## **Strategy 2. Form Local Networks with Interdependent One-Stop Centers**

In contrast to developing relatively autonomous One-Stop centers, some areas have chosen to develop interdependent One-Stop networks within local service areas. This approach has been used most frequently to address the particular service delivery challenges faced by urbanized areas that have a highly diverse customer base. Although the services offered are sometimes differentiated to respond to their specific customers' needs and interests, the different One-Stop centers within interdependent networks usually share a single or overlapping management structure, a common service philosophy, and guidelines propounded by a shared local system-level policy or advisory board.

### **Examples of Forming Interdependent One-Stop Networks**

**Example #1—Designing a “Tiered” Network Approach.** When fully developed, the Baltimore One-Stop network will include:

- Three *full-service career centers* offering a comprehensive menu of staffed and self-service options, open to the general public as well as individuals qualifying for targeted services;
- A number of *specialized centers* including free-standing Job Service offices with limited ES/UI services, centers specializing in youth services, and centers specializing in services to welfare-dependent families; and
- A network of *satellite “village centers”* staffed by community-based organizations that will conduct outreach to residents of targeted low-income neighborhoods, provide counseling on education and employment, and refer interested residents to services available in other network locations. **Baltimore, Maryland**



**Example #2—Using a Network to Ensure Customer Access in a Large Metropolitan Area.** The Arlington Career Center is one of seven One-Stop centers in Tarrant County that are administered by two different organizations. A single workforce development board has recently been formed to provide unified policy oversight over what used to be two distinct JTPA service delivery areas. An electronic communications network links all centers and the office of the local policy board.

The partners in the Tarrant County Career Center network have adopted a flexible network approach to the provision of One-Stop services, with each of the seven full-service Career Centers in the County offering a different configuration of co-located and “no wrong door” linkages to comprehensive services for Center customers. **Arlington, Texas**

### **Strategy 3. Coordinate Referrals to Off-Site Partners**

Full co-location of all local One-Stop partners may not always be feasible. Because of this, local sites may choose to develop extensive and coordinated referral linkages with non-co-located or “supporting” partners. Services available through referral to off-site partners often include: (1) business services offered by community colleges or local economic development agencies, (2) education and training services available from local secondary and post-secondary education and vocational training programs, (3) vocational rehabilitation and welfare-to-work services from partners not co-located at the One-Stop center; and (4) family, health, and social services available from a variety of public and private community agencies.

### **Examples of Developing Alternatives to Full Co-Location**

**Example #1—Using Out-Stationed Staff and Nearby Service Sites to Promote Service Coordination Among Local Agency Partners.** At the Arlington Career Center in Texas, facility constraints prevented the full co-location of ES, UI, and JTPA partners at the time of the site visit. However, some ES staff were out-stationed at the One-Stop center and the rest of the ES and UI staff were located in a separate service site only a block away and were readily available to One-Stop career center customers.  
**Arlington, Texas**

**Example #2—Offering Integrated Intake with Co-Located Agency Staff One Afternoon a Week.** At the Wood County Ohio center, co-location of all mandatory partners was required at least one afternoon a week. At the pre-arranged time, all partners out-stationed staff at the center to provide information, intake, and referral to all services provided by local partners. At other times, services provided by the JTPA and welfare-to-work programs were available on-site, while staff from other agencies could be reached by phone or using electronic linkages to their “home offices.”  
**Bowling Green, Ohio**

**Example #3—Referring Employers to Enhanced Services Available from Partner Agencies at Other Locations.** The local One-Stop center in Columbia Maryland informs employers about enhanced employer services available from the Howard County Community College and the Business Resource Center of the local Economic Development Authority. Both of these partners offer a range of employer services, including business planning, business counseling, employer seminars, customized training, and relocation information and assistance. **Columbia, Maryland**

### **GOAL 3. FORM EFFECTIVE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES FOR LOCAL ONE-STOP SYSTEMS**

States and local areas have adopted varied governance and management structures for One-Stop centers and networks. In most cases, however, One-Stop partners have developed governance and management structures at three distinct substate levels. In this section, we discuss the different approaches One-Stop partners may use to (1) guide local One-Stop systems, (2) manage One-Stop centers, and (3) plan for continuous improvement of center-based operations. These strategies are used in combination to govern most local One-Stop systems.

#### **Strategy 1. Develop Governance or Advisory Bodies to Guide Local One-Stop Systems**

One-Stop systems are often overseen by local or regional governance or advisory bodies. In some cases, these policy bodies consist of managers from the different agencies involved in One-Stop system planning. More often, they also include representation from local elected officials, economic development entities, educational institutions and organizations, social services agencies, and community-based organizations.

States vary considerably in the level of guidance they give to local One-Stop systems on the roles and composition of One-Stop policy and governance bodies. One possible approach is for states to allow local service delivery areas to use existing structures—often JTPA private industry councils (PICs)—as the governance boards for local One-Stop systems. Another approach is for states to require that One-Stop systems establish new governance structures—often referred to as Workforce Development Boards. In general, local policy boards are intended to represent the interests of all major stakeholders in the new system. In many cases, these new boards grow out of local or regional planning committees established during the planning phases of One-Stop implementation.

Where PICs are designated as the governing bodies for the local One-Stop system, their roles are often substantially different from the role they play under the JTPA program. In JTPA, PICs frequently play a dual role of providing program oversight and delivering services to customers. In the One-Stop system, local policy boards may be encouraged or required to separate the oversight and service delivery roles by moving away from the direct delivery of services.

The responsibilities of local One-Stop policy bodies usually include: (1) assisting in the development of agreements among local partners and approving those agreements, (2) ensuring that local One-Stop centers and systems are implemented in accordance with local and state agreements, (3) overseeing the day-to-day management of One-Stop systems, (4) providing oversight of local financial practices, and (5) reviewing performance of the One-Stop system as a whole and individual workforce development programs and ensuring that required performance standards are achieved.

Some states also delegate to local policy boards the responsibility for selecting One-Stop center operators and/or certifying One-Stop centers using criteria established by the state.

### **Examples of Developing Policy Bodies for Local One-Stop Systems**

**Example #1—Emphasizing Local Initiative.** State legislation in Texas created workforce development service areas and encouraged local areas to form Workforce Development Boards to designate local service providers and oversee the design and operation of local One-Stop centers. In areas where they have begun to operate, boards have assumed many of the planning, monitoring, evaluation, and fiscal functions for all local workforce programs. For example, in the 13-county Gulf Coast area containing Houston and Galveston, the Workforce Development Board will have broad-ranging responsibility for regional workforce development services, including ES, UI, JTPA, school-to-work, welfare-to-work, adult basic education, and proprietary vocational education programs. **Lake Jackson, Texas**

**Example #2—Designing Governance Structures In a Competitive**

**Context.** In Massachusetts, Regional Employment Boards “charter” local One-Stop center operators. These charters are revocable if center operators fail to meet identified performance benchmarks. The Board responsible for the Springfield center was one of the first in the state to engage in a competitive bidding process for operating One-Stop centers, seeking “innovative partners” who would provide creative customer-oriented services. During its first year of operation, the Springfield center—operated by a private for-profit entity—implemented a new menu of services for employer and job-seeker customers. **Springfield, Massachusetts**

**Example #3—Encountering Resistance to Local Policy Boards.** In Wisconsin’s Waukesha County, the proposed creation of a new local governance body was met with substantial resistance. During its early planning and implementation phases, the local One-Stop center was guided by a collaborative planning team consisting of a representative from each of the core public agency partners, including the local Job Service, JTPA PIC, JOBS administrative entity, and the local Technical College.

When the state called for the establishment of local human resource investment boards to oversee local One-Stop systems, Waukesha’s One-Stop partners were opposed to what was perceived as another layer of bureaucracy. They were also concerned about the potential disruption of their own consensus-based collaborative decision-making process, which they believed worked exceptionally well. In the face of opposition from a number of local areas, the state postponed establishing formal local One-Stop governance boards. **Pewaukee, Wisconsin**

**Strategy 2. Design Center and Network Management Structures**

One-Stop partners formed a variety of structures for the day-to-day management of their One-Stop systems. These ranged from having a single director with overall

authority for policy and management within a center to shared center management using a management team representing multiple agency partners.

### **Single Manager**

Some centers have designated a single individual as One-Stop center director or manager. This individual is usually responsible for coordinating shared center facilities, equipment, and services. The single-manager system has several advantages, including having only one person responsible for final decisions about day-to-day center operations.

A potential disadvantage of the single-manager model is that other partners may feel that the agency for which the manager works has disproportionate influence in formulating center-wide policies. To ensure that all partner agencies will have the ability to influence decisions about center-wide management, many sites with a single center director also convene an interagency management committee. The interagency committee provides a forum for interagency planning and resolution of sensitive operational issues, such as how to share space and equipment, how to establish staff duties and work assignments, and how to coordinate the delivery of services to individual and employer customers.

To avoid tensions between partner agencies over decisions made by a single center manager, some sites have hired a One-Stop center manager not previously affiliated with any of the local partner agencies.

### **Examples of Using a Single Center Manager**

**Example #1—Designating the JTPA Director as Center Manager.** The Creston center is managed by the JTPA director who is responsible for overall management of the shared physical facility and day-to-day center operations. The director also serves as the primary liaison between the various state agencies, departments, and programs represented at the center. The center director coordinates closely with the Employment Service office manager in administering the center's day-to-day functions. **Creston, Iowa**

**Example #2—Using a Single Center Manager Supported by a Team of Individual Program Managers.** In Lake Jackson, Texas, the center formed a management team that included a single center manager as well as supervisors for the UI, ES, JTPA, JOBS, and VETS programs—all of whom were employed by the same state agency. This management committee was jointly responsible for day-to-day administration, staffing, and scheduling decisions. Management committee meetings also provided opportunities to coordinate center activities, share information on service provision, and establish long-range planning goals for the center. **Lake Jackson, Texas**

### **Dual Managers**

Another approach is to designate two representatives of key partners as co-managers within a partnership of equals. Although this is helpful in avoiding the perception that there is a single “lead agency,” it can make it more difficult for the center managers to make timely decisions.

### **Examples of Using Dual Center Managers**

**Example #1—** The lead staff responsible for providing welfare-to-work and JTPA services in the Wood County Employment Resource Center were designated as co-managers of the center. These co-managers jointly oversaw center operations, assisted in resolving conflicts among partners, and carried out the action plans approved by the center’s governance council. Each co-manager also had specific responsibilities. The welfare-to-work co-manager chaired the center’s interagency team while the JTPA co-manager was in charge of overseeing the financial aspects of center operations. **Bowling Green, Ohio**

## **Team Management**

In another approach, management is conducted by a committee representing all core agency partners. Each member of the management team is individually responsible to his or her own agency for specific program-related duties. As a group, the management team provides oversight and management of shared One-Stop services. Advantages of this approach are that responsibility is shared equally among core partners. A potential disadvantage is that the process of building consensus tends to be difficult.

### **Examples of Using Team Management**

**Example #1—Using an Interagency Steering Committee.** In Anoka County, Minnesota, day-to-day management of the center is provided by a steering committee that directs and coordinates center operations. The steering committee is co-chaired by the directors of four core agency partners within the Center and meetings are attended by representative staff and directors from all agency partners. The steering committee makes recommendations to the local One-Stop governance body on issues of service improvement, provides input to the preparation of the center's budgets and service coordination plans, oversees customer satisfaction and outcome measurement, and maintains ongoing communication with front-line staff on a variety of policy, funding, and operational issues. **Blaine, Minnesota**

**Example #2—Management by a “Partners Group” Consisting of All Public and Private Non-Profit Center Partners.** The One-Stop center in Des Moines, Iowa, is managed by an interagency team that guides use of the shared facility and the consolidation of core One-Stop services. Center management is shared by senior staff from all eight core partners at the center. **Des Moines, Iowa**



**Example #3—Combining a Collaborative Management Team with a Single Center Manager.** The day-to-day operation of the Waukesha County Workforce Development Center is overseen by a management team consisting of top-level representatives from six of the key partner agencies at the center. All center partners contribute to the salary of a center manager who coordinates common functions and facilitates planning for integrated services. **Pewaukee, Wisconsin**

**Strategy 3. Develop “Operations Teams” to Plan for Continuous Improvement of One-Stop Operations**

Many One-Stop centers form interagency operations teams to facilitate coordination and to develop operational procedures for the center. In some cases, task-specific teams are formed to solve particular problems or conduct specific collaborative projects. In other cases, One-Stop centers have established on-going operational committees with specific responsibilities for coordinating One-Stop operations.

These interagency teams play key roles in shaping One-Stop center policies and service designs to address such issues as (a) how to teach customers to use self-access services, (b) how to cross-train staff to assist customers in resource areas and provide job placement support services, (c) how to provide integrated services in such areas as assessment, vocational counseling, and case management.

**Examples of Developing Operations Teams**

**Example #1—Using Center-Wide Teams to Address Specific System-Building Issues.** In the Springfield, Massachusetts, FutureWorks Career Center, a career development team coordinated with resource room staff to identify providers of training for specific career areas. A “No Excuses”

team was also formed to improve the customer focus of services and use customer feedback in its continuous feedback process. **Springfield, Massachusetts**

**Example #2—Using Interagency Teams to Design Integrated Services.**

At the Minnesota Workforce Center–Anoka County, several operations committees, composed of front-line and supervisory staff, have been formed to coordinate the various common service functions including intake, information services, assessment and career planning, job search, training, and case management. **Blaine, Minnesota**

**Example #3—Involving Front-Line Staff in Teams to Design Core One-Stop Services.** In Willimantic, Connecticut, there are a number of committees and work teams comprised of local front-line staff. These teams meet to share ideas on improving the integration and delivery of services to customers. Two of the most active committees are a Workshop Committee, which decides what workshops will be offered at the Center, and an Assessment Team, which coordinates assessment methods. **Willimantic, Connecticut**

**GOAL 4. DEVELOP STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS TO SUPPORT COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION OF ONE-STOP SERVICES**

Local One-Stop partners have adopted several different approaches to staffing coordinated customer services within One-Stop systems.

One approach is to consolidate the staffing of a few customer services—such as customer reception and support of customers using self-access resource areas—but to maintain separate staffing of all other customer services. To reduce duplication of effort and create a seamless menu of services from the customer perspective, some local One-Stop systems with distinct staffing assignments have different agency partners specialize in the delivery of different services.

Another approach is to assign staff from multiple One-Stop partner agencies to coordinated or consolidated service teams for the delivery of shared customer services

such as assessment, delivery of employment preparation workshops, job development, and job placement. The creation of consolidated service delivery teams can be accomplished either informally or through the formal development of new job descriptions and job assignments. The development of new formal job descriptions and consolidated staff functions often requires center managers to negotiate with unions about job duties and appropriate salary levels, but leads to a clear description of job responsibilities and the knowledge and skills needed to serve customers in an integrated One-Stop setting. Working out these issues can be a formidable and time-consuming challenge in sites that attempt to create new job descriptions.

Informal assignment of staff from different agencies to a consolidated service team requires less initial investment, but can lead to inconsistencies in work procedures and inequities in compensation, work hours, and staff policies across team members who work for different agencies. Another challenge for sites that attempt to create integrated service delivery teams, either formally or informally, is the need to meld the “cultures” of the participating agencies and address staff fears about organizational change. As described in greater detail in Chapter 5 on *Building Staff Capacity*, cross-training is often essential to improve coordination of services by on-site agency partners when separate programs continue to operate independently. Cross-training of staff becomes even more essential when staff from different agencies work together in consolidated functional service teams.

Integrated work teams also pose a challenge to staff supervision procedures if staff employed by several different agencies are working together on the same team. To address this challenge, some centers draw a distinction between “formal” and “functional” lines of supervisory authority. For example, in one local site, managers from all participating agencies entered into a written contract stating that managers from each participating agency retained *formal* supervisory responsibility for the individuals employed by that agency, but allowing individuals from other agencies to provide *functional* supervision of staff.

### **Examples of Staffing Arrangements to Further Integrated Services**

**Example #1—Achieving Coordinated Center Services Without Integrating Staff Across Categorical Programs.** With the exception of Title V programs for Older Workers, all core programs at the Lake Jackson center are administered by the new superagency—the Texas Workforce Commission. Although ES and UI staff were integrated prior to the One-Stop initiative, other programs, such as VETS and JTPA services, continued to be staffed separately from the ES and UI functions. Supervisors for all core programs—ES, UI, VETS, JTPA, and JOBS—meet with the Center site manager in weekly site-based management meetings to coordinate activities of their staff. **Lake Jackson, Texas**

**Example #2—Assigning Staff to Functional Teams to Achieve Service Integration.** Several years before the state received a federal One-Stop implementation grant, staff at the Workforce Development Center in Lawrenceburg, Indiana, began organizing center staff by job function rather than by individual categorical program. Functional teams were established for the delivery of reception, assessment, case management, job development, and employer services.

Managers from all participating agencies entered into a written contract that retained formal supervisory responsibility with the agency that employed each individual, but allowed individuals from other agencies to provide functional supervision of staff. **Lawrenceburg, Indiana**

## **RESOURCES**

The following written materials have been drawn from the nine states included in the national process evaluation. Materials were collected at the time of the evaluation site visits.

### **EXAMPLES OF FORMING LOCAL ONE-STOP PARTNERSHIPS**

#### **Attachment 2-A. Organizational Overview of Anoka County, Minnesota, One-Stop System**

This attachment consists of a chart describing the organizational structure of the Minnesota Workforce Center–Anoka County, including the different agencies that belong to the local One-Stop Coordination and Planning Group. The attachment also shows what interagency committees have been formed to develop and oversee different aspects of One-Stop services.

#### **Attachment 2-B. Excerpts from Wisconsin’s Guide to Convening Local Collaborative Planning Teams (1993)**

Attachment 2-B is excerpted from a “Job Center Technical Assistance Guide” prepared by the State of Wisconsin to assist local sites in developing One-Stop partnerships and designing One-Stop service delivery systems. The attachment describes features of successful local planning structures and provides two examples of model local planning structures drawn from pilot One-Stop sites in Wisconsin.

#### **Attachment 2-C. Meet the Agencies Combining Talents at the Workforce Development Center in Waukesha County, Wisconsin**

Attachment 2-C summarizes the missions of the different agencies that participated in the development of the One-Stop center in Waukesha County, Wisconsin and describes how integration benefited each partner agency.

## **EXAMPLES OF DEVELOPING INTERAGENCY AGREEMENTS**

**Attachment 2-D. Tarrant County Career Centers Coordination Agreement (1996)**

**Attachment 2-E. Memorandum of Understanding for a Workforce Development Center in Waukesha County, Wisconsin (1992)**

**Attachment 2-F. One-Stop Career Center Non-Financial Agreement for Service Delivery Area 12, Anoka County, Minnesota (1994)**

## **EXAMPLES OF FORMING LOCAL ONE-STOP NETWORKS WITH MULTIPLE SERVICE SITES**

**Attachment 2-G. Tarrant County (Texas) Career Centers: One-Stop Access Points**

**Attachment 2-H. Minnesota Workforce Center-Anoka County**

## **EXAMPLES OF MANAGING LOCAL ONE-STOP PARTNERSHIPS**

**Attachment 2-I. Day-to-Day Coordination Procedures for the New London *Connecticut Works* Center**

**Attachment 2-J. Staff Committees Formed to Guide One-Stop Design and Operations at the Minnesota Workforce Center in Anoka County**

**Attachment 2-K. Building Teamwork and Linking One-Stop Staff Using a Center Newsletter: Minnesota Workforce Center in Anoka County**

**Attachment 2-L. A Newsletter Article Describing a One-Stop Partner Retreat in Lucas and Wood County, Ohio**